

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

"Expecting Excellence Every Day"

FIELD OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ANNUAL REPORT

Award of Funds - Fiscal Year 2005

Issued: November 1, 2004

This report is prepared annually by the Michigan Department of Corrections/Office of Community Corrections pursuant to the provisions of the Michigan Community Corrections Act [Public Act No. 511 of 1988, Section 12(1)].

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
▪ Local Government Participation	
▪ Impact on Sentencing Dispositions	
STATE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BOARD PRIORITIES	
▪ Prison Admissions – Felony Target Populations	
▪ Jail Utilization	
▪ Target Populations for Community Corrections Programs	
▪ Interagency Policy and Program Development	
▪ Sentencing Recommendation and Probation Violation Processing	
▪ Administration and/or Operational	
▪ Public Education	
▪ Monitoring and Evaluation	
PROGRESS TOWARD ADDRESSING PRIORITIES.....	5
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS	6
▪ Comprehensive Plans and Services	
▪ Probation Residential Services	
▪ Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program	
▪ Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation	
FY 2005 AWARD OF FUNDS	7
FY 2005 COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PLANS AND SERVICES	9
FY 2005 PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES.....	12
FY 2005 DRUNK DRIVER JAIL REDUCTION & COMMUNITY TREATMENT PROGRAM.....	14

Note: This report has been prepared pursuant to the provisions of Public Act No. 511 of 1988, Section 12(1) which states “The office shall submit an annual report not later than November 1st of each year, detailing the individual requests received by the state board for funding under this act, and the programs and plans approved for funding.”

INTRODUCTION

The Office of Community Corrections, including the State Community Corrections Board, was created pursuant to provisions of Public Act 511 of 1988 as an autonomous agency within the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC). Executive Order 1995-16 transferred the Office of Community Corrections to the Department of Corrections to improve efficiencies in administration and effectiveness within government, and has been established as an organization within the Field Operations Administration.

Local Government Participation

The Office of Community Corrections works in cooperation with offices of the Field Operations Administration (FOA) and local units of government to reduce admissions to prison, improve utilization of local jail facilities, improve rehabilitative services to offenders, and strengthen offender accountability.

Local governments elect to participate in the implementation of the Michigan Community Corrections Act through establishing a local Community Corrections Advisory Board (CCAB) and developing a local comprehensive corrections plan in accordance with Sections 7 and 8 of P.A. 511 of 1988. The plans identify local policies and practices, as well as programs and services which will help them achieve their goals and objectives.

Since 1989, 80 of Michigan's 83 counties have elected to participate through formulation of single county, multi-county, and city-county Community Corrections Advisory Boards. Fiscal Year 2005 funds were awarded to support the implementation or continued operation of community-based sanctions and services in 73 counties.

Impact on Sentencing Dispositions

Michigan's prison commitment rate was 32% in 1990 and has remained relatively stable at 23% since 1999; hence, nearly 80% of the felony offenders are currently being sentenced to community-based sanctions and services. The reduction in the prison commitment rates and the increased use of local sentencing options during the 1990s can be attributed in part to the efforts of local jurisdictions to expand the range of available sentencing options and to concentrate on reducing or maintaining low prison admissions for priority target groups. This focus continues for FY 2005 with priority given to offenders with sentencing guidelines in the straddle cells, probation violators and parole violators.

The March 2004 and September 2004 Biannual Reports provide statewide and county-by-county data which summarize patterns and trends in prison admissions, jail utilization and community-based programming.

State Community Corrections Advisory Board Priorities

The State Community Corrections Advisory Board Objectives and Priorities are a continuation of the priorities which were originally adopted by the Board in February 1999 to strengthen the focus of state and local community corrections policy, practice and programming on treatment effect and recidivism reduction.

These priorities are a primary focus of the reviews of community corrections comprehensive plans and proposals of local jurisdictions and a key determinant of the awards of P.A. 511 funds.

PRISON ADMISSIONS - FELONY TARGET POPULATIONS

- Reduce or minimize prison admissions for: (a) offenders with sentencing guidelines within the straddle cells, especially those with a PRV \geq 35 excluding G&H, (b) probation violators; and (c) parole violators.
- Offenders within the presumptive prison group should not be targeted as a group; jurisdictions should examine sentencing options on a case-by-case basis to determine if local programs are appropriate alternatives to a prison commitment.
- Community-based sanctions and services, including the creative use of jail time in conjunction with other community-based supervision, for offenders within straddle cells without compromising public safety.
- Probation violators are a priority population since: 1) technical violations are not addressed in the statutory guidelines; 2) violators account for a large proportion of prison admissions; 3) long jail sentences in response to violations contribute to jail crowding.
- The state and local jurisdictions should utilize comprehensive case planning to determine the most effective sanctions and services available locally. Case planning should begin as early as possible in the process and consider initial disposition, local probation violation response guidelines and available community-based resources. The impact upon public safety, jail crowding, prison commitments and recidivism reduction should be determinant factors.
- Parole violators should be a priority population since this group contributes to jail crowding, increases utilization of prison resources and must be reintegrated into the community effectively to reduce recidivism.

JAIL UTILIZATION

Public safety should be the primary factor in determining the use of jail resources. Whenever possible, jail resources should be prioritized for use by individuals convicted of crimes against persons and/or offenders who present a higher risk of recidivism.

- The local community corrections comprehensive plan should establish clear guidelines, policies and procedures to ensure appropriate use of all sentencing options for all offender populations.
- For higher risk/need cases, jail should be utilized as a condition of probation and as part of a sentence plan, which includes short term in jail with release to other forms of supervision and/or treatment.

TARGET POPULATIONS FOR COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS

- Felony offenders with multiple prior convictions and/or multiple probation violations should receive higher priority than first time, civil and ordinance offenders. The targeting of lower level offenders must be accompanied by quantitative measures that show how targeting these populations will significantly affect state and local criminal justice objectives.
- If misdemeanants are included in the local target populations for treatment programs then priority should be given to offenders with multiple prior convictions, including felony convictions, and a current offense for domestic violence, retail fraud, or drunk driving.
- MDOC/FOA may refer state parole violators to appropriate local correctional interventions. This includes available community corrections-funded sanctions and services. A parole violator who is bound for prison or TRV center should be considered for referral to community corrections-funded sanctions and services. All referrals and placements shall comply with state and local policy and be consistent with state and local target populations.
- Jurisdictions should annually review and update, as needed, target populations and program specific eligibility criteria for community corrections programs and update the range of sentencing options for all population groups.
- Community-based supervision and treatment services are to be restricted to higher risk/need cases consistent with principles of effective intervention. Priorities are on cognitive-based programming and education/employment services.
- Eligibility for Probation Residential Services is restricted to felons with SGL Min/Max of 9 or greater on the initial disposition or Min/Max of 6 or greater for probation violators.

INTERAGENCY POLICY AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

CCABs should actively participate with Community Mental Health, law enforcement, and other agencies in the development of local policy and programming options to reduce admissions to jail and length of stay in jail of mentally ill offenders.

Local policies should be developed and/or updated to increase access to education and employability services for offenders such as those offered through local school districts, Michigan Works, and other local service agencies.

SENTENCING RECOMMENDATION AND PROBATION VIOLATION PROCESSING

Each jurisdiction should annually review sentencing recommendation procedures, probation violation guidelines, and update response guides consistent with MDOC policies to reduce prison admission, improve jail utilization, increase program utilization, increase public safety, and decrease recidivism. Probation violation response guides should identify all available resources to address local needs.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR OPERATIONAL

Local jurisdictions are required to update their local strategic plan and are encouraged to utilize system mapping principles and techniques to: illustrate processes, practices, and decision points within the local system. Further, system mapping should be used to identify and define system issues, examine options to resolve issues, and guide the local comprehensive corrections plan updates and revisions.

Local jurisdictions should describe instruments utilized within the local jurisdiction. Areas to assess should include risk of recidivism and needs for services. A priority should be placed upon criminogenic needs. Individual jurisdictions must describe how the instruments are used and what purpose the instruments serve to guide or support case planning/management and monitoring/evaluation functions

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Local jurisdictions are to present specific objectives and strategies to increase awareness of community sentencing options. These efforts should communicate how these options are used to benefit the community and the offender.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Local jurisdictions must implement and maintain current formal policies and practices that support ongoing monitoring of prison commitments, jail utilization and program utilization. These practices should aid in the determination of how local community corrections comprehensive plan effect prison commitments and jail utilization. Policies must be developed that enhance state and local ability to monitor and evaluate program content, quality and effects upon target populations.

Progress Toward Addressing Objectives And Priorities

In March and April 2003, the Department offered three regional training sessions to the CCABs which provided an overview of the Department's Five Year Plan to Control Prison Growth, which includes the expansion of local sanctions in order to allow communities to determine appropriate punishment for low level offenders who would otherwise be sent to prison. In March 2004, Department conducted two regions sessions which provided an update on the Department's strategic plan. The Department views P.A. 511 as an essential function by which this priority will be accomplished. The Department will partner with local government to revitalize and renew efforts to meet the goals of the Act to reduce admissions to prison of non-violent offenders, especially probation violators, and improve the use of local jails.

The growth in prison intake has been driven by the increase of technical probation violators and offenders sentenced to prison for two years or less -- the exact target population for the P.A. 511 and the priorities adopted by the State Board. A renewed emphasis has been placed on the use of community-based sanctions/services for these target populations, especially straddle cell offenders with Sentencing Guidelines with Prior Record Variables of 35 points or more.

Each jurisdiction has been informed to review sentence recommendations and update probation violation response guides consistent with Department policies in order to achieve a reduction in prison intake, improve jail utilization, and maintain public safety.

Further, local jurisdictions were advised to update: target populations; program eligibility criteria for community corrections programs; and the range of sentencing options for these population groups (i.e., straddle cell offenders with SGLs prior record variables of 35 points or more, probation violators, offenders sentenced to prison for two years or less, and parole violators). These target populations were a primary focus during the review of local community corrections comprehensive plans and a key determinant for the recommendations of the FY 2005 awards.

Multiple changes have been and continue to be made among counties to improve capabilities to reduce or maintain prison commitments, increase emphases on utilizing jail beds for higher risk cases, and reduce recidivism. These changes include:

- Implementation of processes and instruments to quickly and more objectively identify low to high risk cases at the pretrial stage.
- Implementation of instruments and processes to objectively assess needs of the higher risk defendants/offenders.
- Utilization of the results of screening and assessments to help guide the selection of conditional release options for pretrial defendants and conditions of sentencing for sentenced offenders.
- This also includes the development and implementation of policies within local jurisdictions to emphasize proportionality in the use of sanctions/services, i.e., low levels of supervision and services for low risk defendants/offenders and limiting the use of more intensive programming for the higher risk cases.
- Implementation and expansion of cognitive behavioral-based programming with eligibility criteria restricted to the higher risk of recidivism cases.
- The number of counties with cognitive behavioral-based programs increased during 2004 and the number will slightly increase further per the proposals and grant awards for FY 2005. It is noteworthy that the program expansion or increases are being achieved among counties primarily via redirection of funds among program categories, e.g., reducing use of community corrections funds for community service to finance cognitive-based programming.
- Increased focus is being placed on continuity of treatment to ensure offenders are able to continue participation in education, substance abuse, or other programming as they move among supervision options such as the jail, a residential program, and their own place of residence.

The changes which are being made among the counties are consistent with the objectives and priorities adopted by the State Board. They are also in sync with research which has demonstrated that use of prison and jail can be reduced and recidivism reduction can be achieved through effective case differentiation based on risk, sanction and services matching based on objective assessments or risk of recidivism and criminogenic need, proportional allocation of supervision and treatment according to levels of risk and need, and utilization of more intensive (preferably cognitive behavioral based) programming for higher risk of recidivism offenders.

Community Corrections Programs

The planning process prescribed by the Office of Community Corrections requires the Community Corrections Advisory Boards to identify linkages with other agencies, e.g., Michigan Works, Substance Abuse, Community Health, local school districts, etc., to facilitate cost-effective services to offenders and minimize duplication of services and administrative costs.

The Office of Community Corrections has administrative responsibilities for the following:

Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Services funds, awarded to local units of government, support a wide range of sanctions and services (e.g. case management, cognitive behavioral programming, community service, day reporting, education, electronic monitoring, employment services, mental health treatment, pretrial services, substance abuse treatment, etc.) which vary from county to county depending on local needs and priorities. Per the priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board, increased emphases are placed on strengthening treatment effect of programs and services supported by community corrections funds.

Probation Residential Services funds are utilized to purchase residential and support services for eligible felony offenders. The FY 2005 funds, awarded for residential services, support an average daily population of 1009. Emphases are on continued development of variable lengths of stay for different population groups – especially probation and parole violators, and improving program quality and offender movement between PRS and other local sanctions and services.

Note: Funding for the County Jail Reimbursement Program (CJRP) is included within the appropriation for the Office of Community Corrections functions. The Michigan Department of Corrections County Jail Services Unit has responsibilities for administration of the program.

Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program funds are utilized to increase availability of treatment options to reduce drunk driving and drunk driving-related deaths by addressing the alcohol addiction of felony drunk drivers; to divert from jail sentences or to reduce the length of jail sentences for felony drunk drivers who otherwise would have been sentenced to jail; and to provide a policy and funding framework to make additional jail space available for housing convicted felons with the aim of enabling counties to receive county jail reimbursement.

Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation - Emphases for FY 2005 include: refinement of local policies; improving the structure, design, and cost efficiencies of local programs; and monitoring/assessment of prison admissions, jail utilization program utilization and treatment effect. Data from the Community Corrections and Jail Population Information Systems and the OMNI/BIR extract data base are utilized to: monitor patterns and trends in prison admissions, jail utilization and program utilization; conduct comparative analyses among programs; and assess programmatic and fiscal impacts of policy options. Local jurisdictions utilized various assessment instruments to determine an offender's risk of recidivism and criminogenic needs, produce data/information to guide case planning and case management, and monitor an offender's progress.

FY 2005 AWARD OF FUNDS

Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Applications

During July and August 2004, the State Community Corrections Board reviewed 47 proposals for Community Corrections Funds for FY 2005. The State Board recommended and Director Patricia L. Caruso approve the award of \$31.4 million to support Community Corrections programs in 73 of Michigan's 83 counties.

- The proposals are pursuant to 47 county, city-county, or multi-county comprehensive corrections' plans which provide a policy framework for community corrections' funded programs in the 73 counties.
- During July, 30 proposals and applications for funds were reviewed; \$17.9 million was awarded to support programming in 41 counties.
- Another 17 proposals were reviewed during August, and \$13.3 million was awarded for programming in 32 counties. Livingston County was awarded six-months conditional funding only.

The comprehensive plans and applications submitted by local jurisdictions addressed objectives and priorities of P.A. 511 of 1988 and the Appropriations Act, as well as objectives and priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board and local jurisdictions.

The attached table, entitled "FY 2005 Proposals and Awards of Funds," identifies the requests for Comprehensive Plans and Services, Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program, and Probation Residential Services funds from each jurisdiction and the awards of funds as recommended by the State Community Corrections Board and approved by the Director of the Department of Corrections.

FY 2005 PROPOSALS AND AWARDS OF FUNDS

CCAB	PLANS AND SERVICES		DDJR&CTP		PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES				TOTAL AWARD AMOUNT
	REQUESTED AMOUNT	AWARD AMOUNT	REQUESTED AMOUNT	AWARD AMOUNT	PROPOSED		AWARD		
					AMOUNT	ADP	AMOUNT	ADP	
ALLEGAN	99,680	99,680	17,550	17,550			78,475	5	195,705
BARRY	110,001	88,901	-	-	70,628	4.5	31,390	2	120,291
BAY	165,120	147,820	24,627	22,950	408,070	26	219,730	14	390,500
BERRIEN	212,597	199,500	-	-	549,325	35	517,935	33	717,435
CALHOUN	208,288	208,288	63,000	40,500	549,325	35	423,765	27	672,553
CASS	112,866	83,100	27,000	27,000	156,950	10	141,255	9	251,355
CENTRAL U.P.	81,217	81,217	0	2,700	-	-	-	-	83,917
CLINTON	89,620	77,000	11,525	11,525	15,695	1	15,695	1	104,220
EASTERN U.P.	127,000	127,000	10,300	10,800			-		137,800
EATON	189,555	151,305	55,037	59,388	156,950	10	156,950	10	367,643
GENESEE	434,000	434,000	133,650	133,650	1,255,600	80	1,271,295	81	1,838,945
HURON	54,390	45,800					-	-	45,800
INGHAM/LANSING	289,275	289,300	43,200	43,200	533,630	34	439,460	28	771,960
IONIA	107,400	83,000	31,050	31,050	94,170	6	31,390	2	145,440
ISABELLA	142,575	103,369	12,150	12,150	31,390	2	31,390	2	146,909
JACKSON	197,731	197,700	66,333	60,750	266,815	17	188,340	12	446,790
KALAMAZOO	420,228	403,000	17,550	17,550	1,255,500	80	1,349,770	86	1,770,320
KENT	847,359	807,000	134,750	103,313	1,384,944	97.2	1,177,125	75	2,087,438
LENAWEE	75,000	59,000	8,100	8,100	125,560	8	94,170	6	161,270
LIVINGSTON *	241,882	82,237	76,918	38,459	188,340	12	47,085	3	167,781
MACOMB	806,376	641,000	90,451	90,450	721,970	46	549,325	35	1,280,775
MARQUETTE	90,400	79,000			39,238	2.50	31,390	2	110,390
MASON	90,825	56,400	45,900	45,900	94,170	6	31,390	2	133,690
MECOSTA	67,122	65,300			47,085	3	31,390	2	96,690
MIDLAND	141,913	141,913	33,750	33,750			172,645	11	348,308
MONROE	197,700	190,550	-	-	329,595	21	329,595	21	520,145
MONTCALM	79,180	79,180	22,950	22,950	125,560	8	125,560	8	227,690
MUSKEGON	295,106	237,730	118,235	51,300	612,105	39	612,105	39	901,135
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	223,700	194,305	46,850	32,400	78,475	5	62,780	4	289,485
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN	392,160	392,160	54,000	54,000	172,645	11	141,255	9	587,415
OAKLAND	1,495,853	1,279,853	760,050	760,050	1,573,800	100	1,569,500	100	3,609,403
OSCEOLA	65,055	51,600	-	-			15,695	1	67,295
OTTAWA	240,000	220,000	85,050	85,050	94,428	8	94,170	6	399,220
SAGINAW	327,500	301,600	81,000	81,000	1,020,175	65	706,275	45	1,088,875
SANILAC	61,825	61,825					-	-	61,825
SHIAWASSEE	88,798	59,598	41,800	41,800	15,695	1	15,695	1	117,093
ST. CLAIR	187,500	187,500	121,500	121,500			565,020	36	874,020
ST. JOSEPH	111,571	104,100	-	-	565,020	36	360,985	23	465,085
SUNRISE SIDE	131,850	122,450	20,250	20,250	125,560	8	78,475	5	221,175
THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT	180,710	180,710	62,100	62,100	188,340	12	141,255	9	384,065
THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT	152,000	152,000	33,395	41,850	47,085	3	31,390	2	225,240
THUMB REGIONAL	367,379	179,800	82,250	124,200	125,560	8	94,170	6	398,170
TRI COUNTY REGIONAL.	123,081	123,081						-	123,081
VAN BUREN	149,040	119,730	-	-	235,425	15	141,255	9	260,985
WASHTENAW	444,945	273,724	59,400	59,400	376,680	24	329,595	21	662,719
WAYNE	3,246,500	2,999,400	275,400	275,400	3,704,020	236	3,295,950	210	6,570,750
WCUP	321,520	294,720			78,690	5	31,390	2	326,110
TOTALS	14,285,393	12,557,446	2,767,071	2,643,985	17,414,213	1,120	15,773,475	1,005	30,974,906

Community Corrections Plans and Services

FY 2005 Appropriation	\$13,033,000
FY 2005 Award of Funds	\$12,557,446

FY 2005 Community Corrections Plans and Services funds have been awarded to support community-based programs in 73 counties (47 county, city/county, or multi-county CCABs). Additional awards are expected to be made during the year to initiate programming in additional counties. Livingston County was awarded six-months conditional funding only.

The Plans and Services funds are utilized within local jurisdictions to support a wide range of programming options for eligible defendants and sentenced offenders. The distribution of funds among program categories is presented below.

Resource Commitment by Program Category:

Community Service	\$1,114,338
Education	\$1,412,653
Employment/Training	\$ 209,153
Intensive Supervision	\$1,543,469
Mental Health	\$ 232,014
Pretrial	\$1,346,824
Substance Abuse	\$1,512,027
Case Management	\$2,022,082
Other	\$ 455,550
CCAB Administration	\$2,709,336

The commitment of funds among program categories has been changing, and it is expected that this pattern will continue over time as increased efforts are made throughout the state to address recidivism reduction through improving treatment effectiveness. More specifically, it is expected there will be a continued shifting of resources to cognitive behavioral-based and other programming for high risk of recidivism offenders.

This shifting or reallocation of resources, which began during FY 1999 and continued through the FY 2005 proposal development and award of funds processes, reflects the effort and commitment of local jurisdictions to improve treatment effectiveness and reduce recidivism through the development and implementation of new approaches to substance abuse treatment, education and employment programming, improved case planning, sanction and service matching, case management functions, and strengthened monitoring and evaluation capabilities.

Resource Commitment by Local Jurisdiction

The sanctions and services for each jurisdiction, which are supported by FY 2005 Comprehensive Plans and Services funds, are identified on the attached table entitled, "Comprehensive Plans and Services: Summary of Program Budgets - FY 2005.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
FIELD OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION
Office of Community Corrections

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS AND SERVICES: SUMMARY OF PROGRAM BUDGETS - FY 2005

CCAB	COMMUNITY SERVICE	EDUCATION	EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING	INTENSIVE SUPERVISION	MENTAL HEALTH	PRETRIAL	SUBSTANCE ABUSE	CASE MANAGEMENT	OTHER	ADMIN.	TOTAL
ALLEGAN	16,640	36,240	-	14,900	-	-	-	19,000	-	12,900	99,680
BARRY	2,500	37,978	-	21,753	-	-	-	-	-	26,670	88,901
BAY	12,000	17,560	-	-	-	22,500	34,260	18,000	-	43,500	147,820
BERRIEN	-	15,000	16,903	70,000	-	-	20,000	43,897	-	33,700	199,500
CALHOUN	-	-	-	40,000	-	80,650	20,000	19,050	-	48,588	208,288
CASS	5,400	-	-	9,600	-	-	19,500	23,400	-	25,200	83,100
CENTRAL U.P.	55,472	-	-	1,000	-	-	-	-	1,000	23,745	81,217
CLINTON	-	27,500	7,280	7,500	-	-	-	11,620	-	23,100	77,000
EASTERN U.P.	52,593	-	-	36,116	-	-	-	-	-	38,291	127,000
EATON	36,000	29,875	-	3,500	-	-	-	25,030	11,000	45,900	151,305
GENESEE	15,000	-	-	60,000	5,000	55,000	74,000	108,000	-	117,000	434,000
HURON	18,000	4,500	-	-	-	-	7,075	2,500	-	13,725	45,800
INGHAM/LANSING	53,000	-	64,600	35,000	-	-	62,200	12,500	-	62,000	289,300
IONIA	18,000	25,000	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	25,000	83,000
ISABELLA	-	44,919	-	20,000	-	-	-	12,000	-	26,450	103,369
JACKSON	46,600	40,000	-	45,800	-	-	-	12,500	-	52,800	197,700
KALAMAZOO	24,000	6,000	-	77,000	-	137,000	83,500	2,500	-	73,000	403,000
KENT	58,086	35,280	33,270	100,000	37,800	135,664	184,250	-	36,150	186,500	807,000
LENAWEE	24,000	4,500	-	6,000	-	-	-	9,000	-	15,500	59,000
LIVINGSTON	-	15,350	-	21,100	-	4,500	-	25,015	-	16,272	82,237
MACOMB	59,500	109,000	-	102,500	-	106,000	96,000	30,000	2,000	136,000	641,000
MARQUETTE	26,000	15,000	-	17,000	-	-	-	-	-	21,000	79,000
MASON	3,000	2,000	500	-	14,000	-	3,000	18,000	-	15,900	56,400
MECOSTA	22,000	-	-	14,000	-	-	-	13,500	-	15,800	65,300
MIDLAND	-	-	2,600	-	15,408	-	74,252	19,868	3,000	26,785	141,913
MONROE	-	-	12,000	7,150	15,600	12,000	108,800	-	-	35,000	190,550
MONTCALM	27,450	10,750	-	18,500	-	-	13,880	-	-	8,600	79,180
MUSKEGON	-	20,000	25,000	-	-	40,000	30,000	58,500	-	64,230	237,730

CCAB	COMMUNITY SERVICE	EDUCATION	EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING	INTENSIVE SUPERVISION	MENTAL HEALTH	PRETRIAL	SUBSTANCE ABUSE	CASE MANAGEMENT	OTHER	ADMIN.	TOTAL
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	11,000	18,000	-	23,000	16,000	5,000	8,000	68,270	-	45,035	194,305
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN	-	88,200	-	-	17,780	-	41,500	195,806	3,000	45,874	392,160
OAKLAND	25,000	45,000	18,000	34,000	-	562,816	65,000	427,000	-	103,037	1,279,853
OSCEOLA	31,900	3,600	-	2,500	-	-	-	-	-	13,600	51,600
OTTAWA	54,000	25,000	-	80,000	-	-	-	18,755	-	42,245	220,000
SAGINAW	-	16,000	5,000	12,500	-	120,000	60,000	30,000	-	58,100	301,600
ST. CLAIR	-	16,200	-	15,000	-	38,800	8,200	78,200	-	31,100	187,500
ST. JOSEPH	-	25,000	-	32,900	20,200	-	-	-	-	26,000	104,100
SANILAC	36,775	-	-	-	-	-	9,050	-	-	16,000	61,825
SHIAWASSEE	-	25,083	-	16,715	-	-	-	-	-	17,800	59,598
SUNRISE SIDE THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT	8,000	10,000	-	-	68,200	-	-	-	-	36,250	122,450
THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT	-	10,000	-	57,860	10,000	-	-	77,150	-	25,700	180,710
THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT	17,922	27,608	-	11,187	12,026	-	24,200	19,557	-	39,500	152,000
THUMB REGIONAL	43,000	-	-	24,000	-	-	46,000	22,800	-	44,000	179,800
TRI COUNTY REGIONAL	76,000	8,400	-	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	36,681	123,081
VAN BUREN	25,000	26,010	-	7,820	-	-	-	39,765	-	21,135	119,730
WASHTENAW	-	30,000	24,000	36,268	-	26,894	70,000	29,399	-	57,163	273,724
WAYNE	20,000	540,000	-	437,600	-	-	324,460	529,500	399,400	748,440	2,999,400
WCUP	190,500	2,100	-	23,700	-	-	9,900	-	-	68,520	294,720
TOTALS	1,114,338	1,412,653	209,153	1,543,469	232,014	1,346,824	1,512,027	2,022,082	455,550	2,709,336	12,557,446

Probation Residential Services

FY 2005 Appropriation	\$15,828,400
FY 2005 Award of Funds	\$15,773,475

FY 2005 funds were awarded to support residential services pursuant to 42 local comprehensive corrections' plans. The FY 2005 awards respond to program utilization patterns between local jurisdictions and create greater capabilities for local jurisdictions to purchase residential services for eligible felony offenders from a wider range of providers. Livingston County was awarded six-months conditional funding only.

During FY 2005, emphases continue to be on: utilizing residential services as part of a continuum of sanctions and services (e.g., short-term residential substance abuse treatment services followed by outpatient treatment as appropriate, residential services followed by day reporting), reducing the length of stay in residence, increasing the utilization of short-term residential services for probation violators, and increasing utilization for parole violators.

The FY 2005 appropriation supports an average daily population (ADP) of 1008.

It is expected an increase in utilization of Probation Residential Services may be experienced in FY 2005 and that the actual ADP will be greater than 1008.

The increased utilization for FY 2005 is expected due to several factors:

- It is expected that greater emphasis on parole violators will have an impact on the utilization rates of residential services – fifty residential beds have been dedicated for this population. The closing of the Kalamazoo Residential Programming Center and the Woodward Corrections Center in Wayne County will likely have an impact on utilization rates of residential services.
- It is expected that the changes in the County Jail Reimbursement Program Utilization eligibility criteria for felons convicted of OUIL 3rd offences will continue to have an impact the utilization rates of residential services.
- Utilization patterns among other jurisdictions are expected to continue to increase through FY 2005.
- The statutory guidelines will continue to produce increased demands for residential services. Specifically, offenders with guideline scores in the straddle cells and the higher end of the intermediate sanction cells are increasingly sentenced to a jail term followed by placement in a residential program.
- Administrative changes and program referral processes in Wayne County are likely to have a greater impact on program utilization rates of residential services.
- Attention will continue to be focused on the utilization of residential services in response to probation violations and eligible parole violators in accordance with the department's policies and procedures.

The attached table provides information regarding the past three fiscal years' data of the actual average daily population, the FY 2005 awards, and the authorized average daily population of each jurisdiction.

PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

Summary of Average Daily Populations

CCAB	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004 (Thru July)	FY 2005	
	ADP	ADP	ADP	ADP	ADP	AUTH. ADP	AWARD
ALLEGAN					4.65	5	78,475
BARRY					0.90	2	31,390
ALLEGAN/BARRY	3.2	6.4	5.4	6.30			-
BAY	5.2	4.1	6.5	5.31	5.20	14	219,730
BERRIEN	18.1	18.1	30.7	36.50	32.37	33	517,935
CALHOUN	19.4	19.6	24.5	26.82	21.55	27	423,765
CASS						9	141,255
CENTRAL U.P.						-	-
CLINTON						1	15,695
EASTERN U.P.							-
EATON	4.3	3.2	4.5	2.99	8.58	10	156,950
GENESEE	81.9	86.2	81.05	84.00	71.78	81	1,271,295
HURON						-	-
INGHAM	30.6	34.2	36	33.22	24.25	28	439,460
IONIA						2	31,390
ISABELLA			0.8	1.07	1.91	2	31,390
JACKSON	15.5	13.5	11.5	9.69	8.51	12	188,340
KALAMAZOO	82.6	84.2	70.9	80.90	75.11	86	1,349,770
KENT	91.9	95.8	98	90.81	86.11	75	1,177,125
LENAWEE					7.54	6	94,170
LIVINGSTON			9.4	3.08	5.50	3	47,085
MACOMB	25.9	25.8	24.6	27.67	27.97	35	549,325
MARQUETTE	1.6	2.4	1.9	1.10	1.60	2	31,390
MASON						2	31,390
MECOSTA						2	31,390
MIDLAND	4.1	4.3	5	2.66	3.63	11	172,645
MONROE	10.4	16.4	18	14.51	19.70	21	329,595
MONTCALM						8	125,560
MUSKEGON	40.2	30.7	35.8	34.54	40.72	39	612,105
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	3.2	3.5	2.6	3.88	2.73	4	62,780
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN	8.4	8.9	9	9.96	6.47	9	141,255
OAKLAND	91.2	91	87.1	104.00	107.94	100	1,569,500
OSCEOLA						1	15,695
OTTAWA	3.8	3	4.9	3.00	3.64	6	94,170
SAGINAW	45.9	51.1	54.4	51.46	56.86	45	706,275
SANILAC						-	-
SHIAWASSEE					0.15	1	15,695
ST. CLAIR	37.3	42.7	44.1	41.03	30.74	36	565,020
ST JOSEPH	37.7	43.1	47.7	45.47	33.97	23	360,985
SUNRISE SIDE	4.3	4.8	5.6	4.40	3.60	5	78,475
THIRTEENTH	7.5	9.8	8.8	10.68	10.20	9	141,255
THIRTY FOURTH	2.5	1.8	2.2	1.46	2.31	2	31,390
THUMB					3.99	6	94,170
TRI COUNTY REGIONAL.						-	-
VAN BUREN	8.3	4.7	10.4	9.10	11.41	9	141,255
WASHTENAW	39.7	25.5	22.4	17.50	19.95	21	329,595
WAYNE	216.9	170.2	149.5	172.15	212.02	210	3,295,950
WEST CENTRAL	4.3	4.2	3.1	1.84	0.61	2	31,390
TOTALS	945.90	909.20	916.35	937.08	954.13	1005.00	15,773,475

Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program

FY 2005 Appropriation	\$3,000,000
FY 2005 Award of Funds	\$2,643,985

The FY 2005 Drunk Driver Jail Reduction and Community Treatment Program (DDJR&CTP) funds were awarded to support treatment options to reduce drunk driving and drunk driving-related deaths by addressing the alcohol addiction pursuant to 35 local comprehensive corrections' plans developed under the P.A. 511.

The Fiscal Year 2005 Appropriations Act, No. 154 of 2004, Section 710 stipulates that the funds are appropriated and may be expended for any of the following purposes:

(a) To increase availability of treatment options to reduce drunk driving and drunk driving-related deaths by addressing the alcohol addiction of felony drunk drivers who otherwise likely would be sentenced to jail or a combination of jail and other sanctions.

(b) To divert from jail sentences or to reduce the length of jail sentences for felony drunk drivers who otherwise would have been sentenced to jail and whose recommended minimum sentence ranges under sentencing guidelines have upper limits of 18 months or less, through funding programs that may be used in lieu of incarceration and that increase the likelihood of rehabilitation.

(c) To provide a policy and funding framework to make additional jail space available for housing convicted felons whose recommended minimum sentence ranges under sentencing guidelines have lower limits of 12 months or less and who likely otherwise would be sentenced to prison, with the aim of enabling counties to meet or exceed amounts received through the county jail reimbursement program during Fiscal Year 2002-2003 and reducing the numbers of felons sentenced to prison.

Resource Commitment by Category:

Assessment Process	\$436,104
Treatment Options	\$1,679,993
Probation Residential Services	\$527,888

The initial awards for the DDJR & CTP were announced between January and February 2004. Counties began implementing new programs or utilizing existing programs in the 2nd quarter of FY 2004. It is expected that program enrollments will continue to steadily increase in FY 2005 which will have a greater impact on the jail reduction and drunk driver related offenses.

Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program

Summary of Award Amounts - FY 2005				
CCAB	IN JAIL ASSESSMENT	TREATMENT SERVICES	PRS	TOTAL
ALLEGAN	17,550	-	-	
BARRY	-	-	-	-
BAY	3,698	14,000		
BERRIEN	-	-	-	-
CALHOUN	5,410	35,090	-	
CASS	18,250	8,750	-	
CENTRAL U.P.	-	2,700	-	
CLINTON	-	7,950	3,575	
EASTERN U.P.	9,060	1,740	-	
EATON	30,300	9,738	19,350	
GENESEE	17,200	116,450	-	
HURON	-	-	-	-
INGHAM/LANSING	-	43,200	-	
IONIA	5,000	20,100		
ISABELLA	-	12,150	-	
JACKSON	11,800	-	48,950	
KALAMAZOO	10,000	7,550	-	
KENT	23,000	80,313	-	
LENAWEE	1,522	6,578	-	
LIVINGSTON	7,069	-		
MACOMB	-	90,450	-	
MARQUETTE	-	-	-	-
MASON	4,350	22,020	19,530	
MECOSTA	-	-	-	-
MIDLAND	5,438	28,312	-	
MONROE	-	-	-	-
MONTCALM	3,700	19,250	-	
MUSKEGON	8,265	43,035	-	
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	5,220	14,500	12,680	
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN	11,610	42,390	-	
OAKLAND	108,750	494,400	156,900	
OSCEOLA	-	-	-	-
OTTAWA	14,000	71,050	-	
SAGINAW	15,572	19,472	45,956	
ST. CLAIR	19,575	101,925	-	
ST. JOSEPH	-	-	-	-
SANILAC	-	-	-	-
SHIAWASSEE	-	41,800	-	
SUNRISE SIDE	6,250	14,000	-	
THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT	-	-	62,100	
THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT	8,265	17,520	16,065	
THUMB REGIONAL	30,450	93,750	-	
TRI COUNTY REGIONAL	-	-	-	-
VAN BUREN	-	-	-	-
WASHTENAW	-	28,010	31,390	
WAYNE	34,800	171,800	68,800	
WCUP	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	436,104	1,679,993	527,888	

